Access to State Government Information

WORK GROUP MEETING #1
DECEMBER 4-5, 2003
COMMITTEE CHARGES

Overall Scope: Committees should consider **all forms** of digital government information, whether classified as a publication, record, database, or anything else.

1. **Access committee**
   Charge: Investigate different methods and tools needs to provide access to all types of digital state government information, whether current or historical. Consider the following areas:
   a. Current state access tools (GILS, FIND NC, State Portal)
      i. What are they?
      ii. Are they effective? Are they viable access solutions?
      iii. What kind of access tool will best serve state government info?
   b. Metadata (NC GILS, other types, scalability, interoperability)
      i. Should we consider using metadata to identify state info on the Web? If so, why? Advantages? Disadvantages?
      ii. Who will create the metadata (information creators, librarians, automated?)
      iii. When will it be created (point of creation?)
      iv. How will metadata facilitate access to information?
   c. Whether access to current information should be different from access to historical information
   d. ADA compliance to ensure access by all
   e. User education needed both for information creators and information seekers
      i. consider how users without technology access will have facilitators to help them find the information

2. **Identification/Assessment**
   Charge: Consider all of the different types of information produced by state government and all of the different ways such information is disseminated. Investigate the creation of a systematic way to find and identify government information in digital formats.
   Consider the following areas:
   a. Methods for identifying state government information
      i. Must be able to identify new information and duplicate information both within and between agencies
   b. Methods for collecting state government information (push or pull?)
   c. Identification of formats being used; assessment for ADA compliance of formats
   d. Creation of a legacy core collection (both print and digital)
   e. Criteria to select information to be preserved
      i. Scope of information
      ii. Aspects of information to be preserved (presentation, content)
      iii. Authenticity requirements
      iv. Retention schedules

3. **Preservation**
   Charge: Investigate the requirements and challenges of preserving digital information.
   Consider the following areas:
   a. Current projects and programs in the state to preserve digital information (ITS digital repository, ENCompass)
   b. Current projects and programs beyond the state
   c. Technology options available (proprietary versus open-source software)
   d. Issues relating to different formats
   e. Potential for collaboration beyond the state (other states, universities, Ibiblio, etc.)
   f. Central versus. distributed responsibilities
   g. Preservation metadata needed
   h. Data volume storage issues (snapshots, databases, etc may take up a lot of room)
   i. Redundancy (e.g. LOCKSS)
   j. Recovery of lost data
   k. How documents are challenged over time
   l. Authenticity/legality of information (characteristics of a trusted digital repository)

4. Marketing
Charge: Evaluate the needs and wants of end-users (all stakeholders are users as they will use the system in one capacity or another) and how to sell the system to the stakeholders. Consider the following areas:
a. Identification of people to champion the cause:
   i. Public sector
   ii. Private sector (lobbyists, associations like NCLA)
   iii. Power stakeholders
b. Need to marshal public support
c. Education of the following people:
   i. Lawmakers (importance of managing digital information)
   ii. State government officials/decision makers.
   iii. State employees and producers of state information.
d. Preparation of a business case for any new programs, including costs and benefits.

Committee Members (to date)

1. Access
      a. Kristin Martin
      b. Joel Sigmon, State Data Center

2. Identification/ Assessment
      a. Jan Reagan
      b. Maury York, ECU
      c. Cheryl McLean, State Library

3. Preservation
      a. Kristin Martin
      b. Druscie Simpson, State Archives
      c. Helen Tibbo, UNC-CH
      d. Karrie Peterson, NCSU
      e. Paul Jones (?), UNC-CH

4. Marketing
      a. Lucy Reid
      b. Sam Stowe, Secretary of State
      c. Maury York, ECU
      d. Bonnie Spiers, State Library